

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of October 9, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 32-35, 47, 49-51, 56 and 59-60 have been amended. Claims 68-74 have been added. Claims 32-35, 47, 49-51, 56, 58-60 and 62-74 are pending upon entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 32-34, 47, 49-51, 58-60 and 62-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wyler *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,047,033, "Wyler"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 58 recites, *inter alia*, a server control configured to select a response template for processing response data, the response template including instructions for converting the response data from a first language format to a second language format, wherein the second language format is selected based on one or more attributes of a requesting terminal. Nowhere does Wyler teach or suggest such features. Wyler generally describes a method for processing and formatting web pages. Abstract. In particular, Wyler describes a process whereby a web page in a first language format (e.g., HTML, JAVA, RTF) is converted into a uniform script language M2O. Col. 11, ll. 37-67. In the M2O format, Wyler describes that the content of a page may be moved around and reformatted according specifications and requirements of a receiving device. Col. 19, ll. 20-50. However, mere reformatting of content of a page does not constitute converting response data from a first *language* format to a second *language* format, as recited in claim 58. Stated differently, the mere modification of margins, font styles, header levels, numbering styles, indentation and the like, does not constitute conversion of a *language* format since the language in which the data is stored and represented remains M2O script or HTML. Wyler further describes that after converting the webpages into M2O script documents, the M2O script language is extracted to build a HTML/WML webpage. Col. 19, ll. 54-57. Even so, Wyler does not teach or suggest selecting the HTML/WML language format (i.e., the alleged second language format) *based on one or more attributes of a*

requesting terminal. It appears from Wyler's disclosure that all M2O scripts are converted into HTML/WML webpages regardless of one or more attributes of a receiving terminal. Accordingly, claim 58 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claims 59, 62 and 65 recite features substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 58 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 58.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Amended independent claims 35 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyler in view of well-known prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 35 and 56 have been amended, rendering this rejection moot. Further, claims 35 and 56 depend from claim 59 and are thus allowable over Wyler for at least the same reasons as claim 59. The Examiner's takings of Official Notice do not cure the above identified deficiencies of Wyler. Additionally, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's takings of Official Notice and respectfully request support for the assertions made. Accordingly, claims 35 and 56 are allowable for at least these reasons.

New Claims

Claims 68-74 have been added. While Applicant's note that claims 68-74 have not been rejected, Applicants submit the following remarks in the interest of expediting prosecution.

Claims 68-74 are dependent on claims 58, 59, 62 and 65, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claim and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claims 68, 71 and 74 relate to, *inter alia*, wherein a template is identified or selected from a plurality of templates, each of the plurality of templates being specific to one of a plurality of services. Nowhere does Wyler teach or suggest such features. In particular, Wyler does not teach or suggest that templates correspond to a particular service. Accordingly, claims 68, 71 and 74 are allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 7, 2008

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001